Case 2:24-cv-00987-TLN-CKD Document 19 Filed 05/20/24 Page 1 of 5

	(1)		
1	BURSOR & FISHER, P.A. L. Timothy Fisher (State Bar No. 191626)		
2	Brittany S. Scott (State Bar No. 327132) 1990 North California Blvd., Suite 940		
3	Walnut Creek, CA 94596 Telephone: (925) 300-4455		
4	Facsimile: (925) 407-2700 E-mail: ltfisher@bursor.com		
5	bscott@bursor.com		
6	Counsel for Plaintiff		
7			
8	UNITED STATES I	DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10	TOTAL DO D. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.	2	
11	JOHN DOE, individually and on behalf of all other persons similarly situated,	Case No. 2:24-CV-00987-TLN-CKD	
12	Plaintiff,	STIPULATION AND ORDER FOR LEAVE TO FILE AMENDED	
13		COMPLAINT	
14	V.		
15	PHILLIP MORRIS INTERNATIONAL INC. and SWEDISH MATCH NORTH AMERICA,		
16	LLC,		
17	Defendants.		
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

STIPULATION TO FILE AMENDED COMPLAINT CASE NO. 2:24-CV-00987-TLN-CKD

Case 2:24-cv-00987-TLN-CKD Document 19 Filed 05/20/24 Page 2 of 5

1	Pursuant to Local Rules 143 and 144, Plaintiff John Doe ("Plaintiff") and Defendants		
2	Swedish Match North America LLC ("Swedish Match") and Philip Morris International Inc.		
3	("PMI") (collectively, "Defendants"), by and through their respective counsel, hereby agree and		
4	stipulate to Plaintiff's filing of a first amended complaint and an extension of time for Defendants		
5	to respond to Plaintiff's Amended Complaint.		
6	WHEREAS, this stipulation is made in good faith and not for the purpose of undue delay.		
7	This stipulation will not alter any deadline previously set by the Court;		
8	WHEREAS, Plaintiff filed his Complaint in this Court on March 29, 2024;		
9	WHEREAS, Plaintiff served Swedish Match on April 4, 2024, and served PMI on April 5,		
10	2024;		
11	WHEREAS, Defendants received one extension of 28 days to respond to Plaintiff's		
12	Complaint pursuant to Local Rule 144(a);		
13	WHEREAS on April 1, 2024, Plaintiff filed an Administrative Motion to Proceed Under a		
14	Pseudonym (ECF No. 2.) (the "Motion");		
15	WHEREAS on May 8, 2024, Swedish Match filed its opposition to Plaintiff's Motion (ECF		
16	No. 17);		
17	WHEREAS, Plaintiff withdraws his Motion;		
18	WHEREAS, the Parties have met and conferred and IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED by and		
19	between Plaintiff and Defendants:		
20	1. Plaintiff shall file by May 23, 2024, an amended complaint for the sole purposes of		
21	disclosing his name and amending his claim for damages under California's Consumer		
22	Legal Remedies Act;		
23	2. This amendment shall not waive Plaintiff's right to amend his Complaint under Fed. R.		
24	Civ. P. 15(a)(1);		
25	3. Defendants shall have 21 days from the filing of Plaintiff's amended complaint to		
26	respond, by answer, motion, or otherwise;		
27			
28			

Case 2:24-cv-00987-TLN-CKD Document 19 Filed 05/20/24 Page 3 of 5

4. Defendants do not waive any jurisdictional, affirmative, or other defenses ¹ and reserve		
all rights, including the right to seek any additional extension of time for good cause.		
Dated: May 20, 2024	Respectfully submitted,	
3	BURSOR & FISHER, P.A.	
	Den /n/ Driggman C. Cong	
	By: <u>/s/ Brittany S. Scott</u>	
	Brittany S. Scott (State Bar No. 327132) bscott@bursor.com	
	Counsel for Plaintiff and the Putative Class	
Dated: May 20, 2024	MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP	
	By: <u>/s/ Bethany W. Kristovich</u> (As authorized on May 17, 2024)	
	Michael R. Doyen (SBN 119687) michael.doyen@mto.com	
	Daniel B. Levin (SBN 226044) daniel.levin@mto.com	
	Bethany W. Kristovich (SBN 241891)	
	bethany.kristovich@mto.com John L. Schwab (SBN 301386)	
	john.schwab@mto.com	
	Attorneys for Defendant Swedish Match North America LLC	
waive and should not be construe available to Defendants under Ru	s stipulation and request for an extension of time is not intered to waive any challenge to personal jurisdiction or other deale 12(b). See Johnson v. Comm'n on Presidential Debates, 1. Jan. 6, 2014); see also Freeney v. Bank of Am. Corp., 201	

26

27

28

waive and should not be construed to waive any challenge to personal jurisdiction or other defense available to Defendants under Rule 12(b). See Johnson v. Comm'n on Presidential Debates, 2014 WL 12597805, at *4–5 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 6, 2014); see also Freeney v. Bank of Am. Corp., 2015 WL 4366439, at *20 (C.D. Cal. July 16, 2015) (filing a notice of related cases, notice of appearance, and motion for extension of time to answer did not constitute a waiver of Rule 12(b) defense); Benny v. Pipes, 799 F.2d 489, 493 (9th Cir. 1986) ("Generally, a motion to extend time to respond gives no hint that the answer will waive personal jurisdiction defects, and is probably best viewed as a holding maneuver while counsel consider how to proceed.").

Case 2:24-cv-00987-TLN-CKD Document 19 Filed 05/20/24 Page 4 of 5

1	Dated: May 20, 2024	LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
2		By: <u>/s/ Christine G. Rolph</u> (As authorized on May 17, 2024)
3		(As authorized on May 17, 2024)
4		Christine G. Rolph (SBN 190798) christine.rolph@lw.com
5		Attorney for Defendant Philip Morris International
6		Inc.
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

Case 2:24-cv-00987-TLN-CKD Document 19 Filed 05/20/24 Page 5 of 5

1	ORD	FD
2	IT IS SO ORDERED.	<u>un</u>
3	IT IS SO CREEKED.	
4		My - Hunley
5	Date: May 20, 2024	
6		Troy L. Nunley United States District Judge
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		

28